

BONHOMME RICHARD'S ALMANC

Val. 2, No. 63

April 22, 2000

"I have not yet begun to fight!"



TROOPS FORCED TO DEPEND ON FEDERALAID

Defense Secretary William Cohen has flatly rejected a proposal floated by one of his own senior aides to tighten food stamp eligibility rules, which would have cut off benefits for several thousand military families.

Cohen has instead proposed a change that would most likely make more military families eligible for that federal assistance program. The flap began when Bernard Rostker, the Pentagon's senior official for Gulf War Illness issues who is expected to be approved shortly as the new Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, told lawmakers at his confirmation hearing last week that he would work with the Agriculture Department to count the value of free on-base housing and utilities as income for calculating food-stamp eligibility.

The net effect of that proposal, which Congress has considered and rejected once before, would be to boost the overall income levels of families who live in government quarters, at least on paper, thus putting food stamps out of reach.

Pentagon officials estimate about 6,300 service members were on food stamps in fiscal 1998, down from about 12,000 in 1995. Larger boosts in pay and allowances in recent years are credited with trimming the number of troops who qualify.

Almost 3,800 troops who get food stamps live on base and currently do not have the value of their housing added to their income levels for calculating eligibility. They are the ones who likely would have been hurt by Rostker's proposal. Pentagon officials initially defended Rostker's position.

At a news briefing Tuesday, Defense Department spokesman Ken Bacon said the current policy is unfair to military families living off base because the housing allowance they receive is counted as part of their total income. Many of those families might qualify for food stamps if they lived in government quarters.

See TROOPS FORCED Page 4



Lcpl. Barbosa Francisco and AMS3 Chris Williamson keep up with the daily corrosion control on 46' wheels yesterday. (Photo by JO3 Laura C. Wiggins.)

SUPREME COURT DEBATES MIRANDA RULING

By Linda Greenhouse

Miranda's moment of truth, a richly symbolic test of whether this landmark of the Warren Court will survive the conservative era of the Rehnquist Court, arrived in a crowded Supreme Court with the justices armed for battle.

For the justices who favor upholding the 34-year-old precedent, which requires police to inform suspects of their rights, the weapon of choice was Miranda vs. Arizona itself. They read aloud excerpts that appeared to anchor the decision in the Constitution.

For the justices who have expressed doubt about the decision, the weapons were subsequent rulings that limited Miranda, suggesting that its famous warnings were merely "prophylactic" rather than constitutionally required and allowing prosecutors to use confessions obtained in violation of Miranda for purposes other than direct evidence against a defendant.

BONHOMME RICHARD'S

ALMANAC

Capt. Douglas W. Keith, Commanding Officer
Lt. Chdr. Laurie Rye, Riblic Affairs Officer
JOC(SW/AW) Stephen K. Robinson, Asst. Riblic Affairs Officer
JO1(SW) Robert W. Garnand, Editor
JO3 Laura C. Wiggins, StaffWriter
LI1 Jimmie Claspell, Print Shop

This newspaper is an authorized publication for members of the military services stationed at sea and their families. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the official views of the U.S. Covernment, the Department of Defense or the U.S. Navy and do not imply endorsement thereof.

The central question for the Supreme Court in this case is the constitutional status of Miranda vs. Arizona.

Indisputably, the court intended a Miranda to safeguard the Fifth Amendment right against compelled self-incrimination. The question is whether, as a strategy to accomplish that goal, the essence of the decision is itself constitutionally compelled, in which case Congress cannot overturn it simply by passing a law, or whether the court was adopting one permissible alternative among several.

STOCK MARKET

10,844.05 169.09 DOW: UP NASDAQ: 62.53 3,643.88 DOWN S&P 500: 1,432.49 UP 5.02 6.14 NYSE: 639.41 UP

SATURDAY'S STIE TV SCHEDULE

CHANNEL 2

1030 THAT 70'S SHOW
1100 ODD COUPLE II
1630 BLACK DOG
1800 SATURDAY NIGHT LIVE
1930 FACE/OFF
2200 EVITA

CHANNEL 6

1030 SPIN CITY
1100 MIGHTY JOE YOUNG
1630 SIMPLY IRRESISTABLE
1800 A SMILE LIKE YOURS
1930 ARMAGEDDON
2200 JAWBREAKER

TV SCHEDULE SUBJECT TO CHANGE
DUE TO OPERATIONAL COMMITMENTS

NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL NEWS

FIBER NO HELP FOR COLON CANCER By Gina Kolata

Two rigorous studies involving thousands of people have failed to confirm one of the most widely held beliefs about diet and health: that eating low-fat, high-fiber foods can reduce the risk of colon and rectal cancer.

The studies found that neither eating a low-fat diet with abundant fiber, much of it from fruits and vegetables, nor eating extra fiber in the form of wheat bran made any difference in colon cancer risk. Experts said the research, led by scientists at the National Cancer Institute and the University of Arizona, left them stunned. Colon and rectal cancer is the second-leading cause of cancer-related death in the United States, after lung cancer, and is diagnosed in 130,000 Americans each year.

Public health experts said fiber might nonetheless play another role long attributed to it: reducing the risk of heart disease and diabetes. In both studies, the subjects had had at least one polyp, a tiny noncancerous growth, removed from the colon.

The question was, can a special diet protect these people from developing new polyps? One study, lasting four years, involved 2,079 people randomly assigned to eat low-fat, high-fiber diets with lots of fruits and vegetables or to follow their usual diets. In the other study, 1,429 participants were assigned to eat high-fiber wheat bran cereals or wheat bran fiber bars, or to eat cereals or bars that looked and tasted the same but were low in fiber.

DNA SOLVES A ROYAL MYSTERY By Suzanne Daley

The question has intrigued historians for 200 years. Was the disease-riddled little boy who died in 1795 after years alone in a prison cell really the son of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette? Or had royalists managed, at the height of the French Revolution, to spirit the young heir from harm after his parents were sent to the guillotine?

On Wednesday, two scientists said they could offer proof that the 10-year-old, who died covered with tumors and encrusted with scabies, was indeed Louis XVII. He had endured two years in Temple prison, was left unattended and in the dark for long stretches, and increasingly showed signs of madness.

The scientists, after examining all that remains of the boy, a dried heart, said they had been able to match the boy's DNA with that of other members of the royal family, including DNA taken from a lock of Marie Antoinette's hair.

The scientists, Jean-Jacques Cassiman of the University of Louvain in Belgium and Bernd Brinkmann of the University of Munster in Germany, said they had found enough matching DNA to determine that Marie Antoinette was the boy's mother.

Through the years, more than 500 books have been written about the young dauphin, and many theories emerged about his possible escape and presumed exile. Would-be heirs have popped up all over Europe claiming to be true descendants of the Bourbon line. But the claimants were all impostors, the scientists said.

TROOPS FORCED From Page 1

On top of that, Bacon said, off-base families take other financial hits compared to those who live in government quarters because they pay an average of 19 percent of their housing costs out of their own pockets and may live far away from military commissaries, schools and day-care centers.

"The issue here is equality," Bacon said. "The person who lives off base is disadvantaged in several ways."

In an unusual statement, Cohen said the proposal sent "mixed signals" to service members and he wanted to "set the record straight", by proposing to do the exact opposite.

"I will work with the Agriculture Department to amend current rules so as to exclude the cash housing allowance paid to our people living off base from the computation for eligibility," he said. "This will provide the equality we must maintain, while retaining the food stamp benefits for those who need it."

LAUNDRY SERVICES, RECREATION CENTER AVAILABLE IN JEBEL ALI

NAVADMIN 100/00 is part of our ongoing effort to spread the word on Navy Quality Of Life initiatives and projects that support our Sailors and families.

MWR and the Dubai USO are making things happen in the Arabian Gulf. The two recently teamed up and installed a free—that's right—a free laundry facility for Sailors visiting the port of Jebel Ali. The facility has 30 washers and 30 dryers and is the direct result of input from Sailors around the fleet.

In addition, if you're in Jebel Ali in the spring of 2000, look for a new air-conditioned recreation complex for deployed Sailors.

SPORTS

BASEBALL SCORES:

Minnesota	9	Kansas City	7
Baltimore	8	Tampa Bay	4
Cleveland	9	Oakland	
Toronto	12	Anaheim	11
Atlanta	6	Philadelphia	4
Arizona	3	Colorado	
Cincinnati	11	San Francisco	1
Florida	3	Pittsburgh	
Chi. Cubs	10	Montreal	6
NY Mets	5	Milwaukee	
St. Louis	14	San Diego	1

NHL SCORES:

New Jersey 4 Florida 1 Philadelphia 5 Buffalo 2

BARKLEY PLAYS HIS FINAL GAME By The New York Times

Determined to go out standing up, Charles Barkley thrilled the hometown crowd with 7:26 to go in the second quarter Wednesday night when he reported into the regular season Houston Rockets finale against Vancouver. Barkley, out since Dec. 8 with a ruptured knee tendon, received a standing ovation. He finished with six minutes of playing time, two points, one rebound, one assist and a blocked shot. The Grizzlies, however, won the game 96-92.



Lcpl. Joey Segroves, Lcpl. Jeremy Rushton, and Lcpl. Jorge Grijalva spent yesterday cleaning out their M 249 Squad Automatic Weapons (SAW) after participating in Exercise Eager Mace with Kuwaiti Armed Forces. (Photo by JO3 Laura C. Wiggins.)

13%

14%

15%

16%

17%

18%

19%

20%

21%

22%

23%

COMMAND FINANCIAL SPECIALIST CORNER



The Rule of 72

The "Rule of 72" is a handy mathematical rule which helps to estimate how many years it is investment to double in value at a specified rate of return (or given the number of years desthe investment, what rate of return is required). This rule is expressed as:

Ξ		
1%	72	115
2%	35	57.5
3%	24	38.3
4%	18	28.8
5%	14.4	23
6%	12	19.2
7%	10.3	16.4
8%	9	14.4
9%	8	12.8
10%	7.2	11.5
11%	6.5	10.5

72 = Rate of Return (%)	The number of years it will take an investment to double in value.			
The "Rule of 115" is a similar rule that allows you to estimate how long it will take an investment to triple in value. This rule is expressed as:				
= Rate of Return (%)	The number of years it will take an investment to triple in value.			
APPLICATION These rules can also tell you how long before a given item will double or triple in price at an estimated average rate of				